

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of this response. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in connection with the present application. Of those, claim 1 is the sole independent claim.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicants appreciate and acknowledge the Examiner's careful consideration of all references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement filed September 7, 2001.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting a telephone interview on November 2, 2005. During said interview, Applicants set forth arguments that Fraley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,492, hereinafter referred to as "Fraley") fails to teach at least, "assigning, after creating an automation solution, the automation objects to physical equipment units of a system," the interconnections representing "intra-equipment unit communications relationships," as set forth in claim 1. By contrast, Fraley merely discloses intra-application communications.

At the conclusion of the telephone interview, the Examiner and Applicants were in agreement that Fraley fails to anticipate claim 1. Moreover, the Examiner indicated that upon filing of an After Final Response by

Applicants, the previous prior art rejection in view of Fraley would be withdrawn.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Fraley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,492, hereinafter referred to as "Fraley"). Applicants traverse this rejection.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner relies upon col. 10, ll. 14-37 of Fraley to allegedly teach "assigning, after creating an automation solution, the automation objects to physical equipment units of a system," as set forth in claim 1. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's conclusion.

Fraley is directed to design of object-oriented computer software. Object-oriented computer programming is used to design computer software, which includes object-oriented programming objects further including object data and information. A collection of objects constitutes an object class, or object type, which acts as a template describing behavior of sets of objects (see col. 1; ll. 16-25 of Fraley). Models used in object-oriented programming, include a component object model (COM) and a distributed component object model (DCOM). Both the COM and DCOM specify how objects interact and communicate within a single application, a distributed application or between applications (see col. 1; ll. 31-35 of Fraley). Object linking and embedding (OLE) are used to create objects, which operate on object data rather than

operating on the applications responsible for the data (see col. 1; ll. 43-46 of Fraley).

More specifically, the above referenced portion of Fraley relied upon by the Examiner (i.e., col. 10, ll. 14-37) discusses an object designer 62 that allows software developers to devise queries to remote databases without user interface at run-time. With regard to FIG. 5, object interfaces 80-86 (of the object designer 62) provide object linking and embedding, in-place object activation, and object programmability.

However, Fraley makes no mention or suggestion of any physical equipment or any interaction of automation objects with physical equipment units of a system, let alone assigning "automation objects to physical equipment units of a system," as set forth in claim 1. By contrast, the above cited portion, and all of Fraley, for that matter, is merely devoted to the creating of run-time files for applications or, in other words, the creation of software, without any interaction with "physical equipment units."

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Furthermore, claims 2-20 are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1.

CONCLUSION


In view of above remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding rejection and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Andrew M. Waxman, Reg. No. 56,007, at the number of the undersigned listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC

By 
Donald J. Daley
Reg. No. 34,313

DJD/AMW:jcp
AMW

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 668-8000